

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/552,685	Applicant(s) FUKUHIRA ET AL.	
	Examiner CARALYNNE HELM	Art Unit 1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CARALYNNE HELM (PTO personnel). (3) ____.

(2) BRUCE KRAMER (applicant's representative). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 31 August 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☒103 ☐Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1-8 and 11-18.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Substance of Interview
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Helm indicated that the arguments and accompanying exhibits demonstrated that the invention detailed by claim 4 where dioleoylphosphatidylethanolamine was the required surfactant in the honeycomb structure film was non-obvious over the prior art. Helm provided several suggestions for an examiner's amendment to limit the claims to this embodiment and place more of the claims in condition for allowance. The amendment is as detailed in the accompanying examiner's amendment. Kramer indicated that he would take the suggestions to the applicant. On September 2, 2011, Kramer indicated that the applicants had found the suggested amendment to be acceptable.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/Caralynne Helm/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615	
---	--